IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application: Richard J. MACKOOL Art Unit: 3763

Serial Number: 10/825,046 Examiner: Melissa A. McCORKLE

Filed: 04/15/2004 Confirmation No: 7400

Title: STERILE TUBING SHEATH

IIIE. STERILE TODING SHEATT

Customer No: 26345

Attorney Docket: 103471-51150

Mail Stop: Box AF -- No Fee Commissioner for Patents PO Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE

Sir:

Responsive to the Office Action dated March 6, 2006, please consider the following:

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 2 of this paper.

Application No. 10/825,046 Amendment Dated May 5, 2006 Office Action mailed March 6, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:

The courtesies extended by the Examiner and her supervisor in consenting to

and participating in the telephonic interview of April 18, 2006 are acknowledged and

appreciated.

Claims 1-12 are pending of which claims 6-11 are withdrawn.

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 USC 102 (b) as being anticipated by Bailly et

al (EP 0570255). Claim 12 was rejected under 35 USC 103 over Bailly et al (EP

0570255) in view of Knoll et al. (US 5,242,398). The rejections are respectfully

traversed.

Bailly et al pertain to dentist surgery, not eye surgery devices, and to that extent

constitutes non-analogous art. Just because skilled artisans in the art of dentist surgery

may take steps to prevent contamination of some of their tubing does not mean that

skilled artisans in the field of eye surgery would turn to their technique so as to adopt it

for their own practice.

Bailly et al show a cover 16 with one end connected to an adaptor 4, while the

other end is free.

As best understood, the Examiner's position is that Bailly et al's cover 16 is

connectable to nozzle 7 (although it accommodates insertion of conduit 4). Figs. 2a, 2b,

2c and 3 of Bailly, however, show the nozzle 7 spaced away out of contact from the

cover 16 and therefore not disclosed to be connectable to it. There is no reason to so

connect, even if it were feasible since either the cover 16 would not be integrally formed

with the adaptor 4 or the upstream end of the conduit 4 would become exposed to

environment contamination.

Page 2 of 3

#1038408 v2 103471-51150 Pending independent Claims 1 and 9 recite a sterile, tubular sheath whose distal

end is secured to a hollow extension tube and recite that the sheath is secured to the

aspiration tube (at a location spaced from the distal end of the aspiration tube). The

concept of connection to more than one connection location is completely absent from

Bailly et al.

If there were no connection of the sheath to a location spaced from the distal end

of the aspiration tube, in contrast to the recitation of claim 1, then the sheath would not

be held taut and thus be free to contract into a non-expanded condition. Bailly et al.'s

cover lacks such a characteristic entirely with respect to its cover and is thus deficient

vis a vis the recitation of claim 1.

Knoll et al. does not make up for this deficiency of Bailly et al. Knoll et al relates

to a catheter assembly, thereby being non-analogous art to both Bailly et al. and the

claimed invention. Knoll et al. lacks disclosure of the concept of an expanded sheath

that is secured at two spaced apart locations. Therefore, claim 12 is patentable over

the combination of Bailly et al. and Knoll et al.

Withdrawal of the claim rejections is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Gibbons, Del Deo, Dolan, Griffinger &

Vecchione

Robert J. Hess - Reg. No. 32,139

Tel. No. (212) 554-9611 Fax No. (973) 639-8385

Page 3 of 3

#1038408 v2 103471-51150